DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 106 FL 009 342

AUTHOR Tucker, G. Richard; Sarofim, Marian
TITLE Investigating Linguistic Acceptability with Egyptian EFL Students.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Arabic; Determiners (Languages); *English (Second Language); *Error Analysis (Language); Function Words; *Grammar; *Language Attitudes; *Language Instruction; Language Patterns; Language Skills; Native Speakers; *Second Language Learning; Sentence Structure; Verbs
IDENTIFIERS *Acceptability Judgements (Language); Egyptians

ABSTRACT

A number of errors which typify the English speech or writing of Egyptian students of EFL (English as a foreign language) were identified. A series of matched sentences -- some containing a deviant feature, others not -- were recorded by a native speaker of English and by a native speaker of Arabic. Groups of intermediate and of advanced EFL students listened to tape recordings and rated each sentence in terms of prescriptive grammaticality and social acceptability. Listeners were then presented with the subset of deviant sentences. They were asked to correct the errors and to indicate the extent to which each of the errors bothered or irritated them. Thus, it was possible to examine listeners' reactions to various types of errors and to map out the hierarchy of acceptability of various deviant utterances produced by native and non-native speakers. (Author/CLK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152106

INVESTIGATING LINGUISTIC ACCEPTABILITY WITH EGYPTIAN EFL STUDENTS[1]

G. Richard Tucker
McGill University

Marian Sarofim
American University
in Cairo

ABSTRACT

A number of errors which typify the English speech or writing of Egyptian students of EFL were identified. A series of matched sentences -- some containing a deviant feature, others not -- were recorded by a native speaker of English and by a native speaker of Arabic. Groups of intermediate and of advanced EFL students listened to tape recordings and rated each sentence in terms of prescriptive grammaticality and social acceptability. Listeners were then presented with the subset of deviant sentences. They were asked to correct the errors and to indicate the extent to which each of the errors bothered or irritated them. Thus, it was possible to examine listeners' reactions to various types of errors and to map out the hierarchy of acceptability of various deviant utterances produced by native and non-native speakers.

FL009342

April, 1978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

GR Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

INVESTIGATING LINGUISTIC ACCEPTABILITY WITH EGYPTIAN EFL STUDENTS

G. Richard Tucker
McGill University

Marian Sarofim
American University
in Cairo

In this study, we examined the sensitivity of adult second language learners to deviance in English sentences. Our interest in this area was prompted by general questions such as the following: do non-native speakers of English distinguish between deviant and well-formed sentences from the standpoint of prescriptive grammaticality? Do non-native speakers who "correctly" identify sentences as deviant nonetheless judge some of them to be more "acceptable" than others? Do certain specific types of errors particularly irrirate or bother listeners? Do listeners react similarly to errors produced by native as opposed to non-native speakers of the target language.

We were specifically interested, then, in probing various facets of the metalinguistic awareness of non-native speakers -- an ability which is relatively late in developing even for native speakers (see, for example, Gleitman, Gleitman & Shipley, 1972).

A study by Quirk and Svartvik (1966) served as a general model for our research. Those authors tried to detect through direct and indirect means the sensitivity of native speakers of English to syntactic and semantic deviance. They presented subjects (Ss) with a series of 50 tape-recorded sentences, some of which were normal, and others which differed syntactically or

semantically from acceptable English usage. The Ss were instructed to carry out a simple grammatical operation on each sentence (e.g., make the sentence negative) and it was predicted that they would unconsciously restructure the deviant sentences to conform with their own internalized grammar. Thus, the Ss' responses would provide information about their sensitivity to linguistic acceptability. In a second phase of the experiment, the Ss were asked to make conscious subjective judgments concerning the acceptability of the sentences. The research provided two complementary measures of sensitivity to deviance, and there was, in fact, a statistically significant, positive correlation between Ss' performance on the operations task and the judgment task. In general, native speakers are, of course, sensitive to the constraints of their language which delimit grammaticality.

D'Anglejan (1975) adapted this paradigm for research with French-speaking adult learners of English as a second language. She eliminated 17 sentences which were not judged by Quirk and Svartvik's Ss as being either clearly normal or deviant. She worked with a group of learners who were relative beginners in their study of English and another group who were more advanced as well as with a group of native speakers who were included for comparison purposes. It is interesting to note that her beginning learners were completely unable to recognize deviance, and that there was an increasing ability to distinguish deviant from normal sentences among the advanced Ss and the native speakers.

The beginners neither restructured the deviant sentences during the operations task nor did they rate them toward the incorrect end of the subjective rating scale. However, they were able to recognize normal sentences and to carry out basic grammatical operations on them. D'Anglejan inferred that the ability to recognize deviance was a reliable correlate to developing second language competence.

This line of research contributes, we believe, to a better understanding of the notion of "interlanguage" (see, for example, Corder, 1967) for as several researchers have recently argued a learner's interlanguage cannot adequately be defined by a simple cateloguing of his productions at any time. In addition, we must know how he reacts to or uses or interprets the items that he produces or hears (cf., Johansson, 1978; Singh & d'Anglejan, 1977).

A more recent study conducted by Schachter, Tyson and Diffley (1976) carried this type of research a step further. They elicited gramaticality ratings for well formed and for deviant sentences from Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Persian and Spanish learners of English. Each S was presented with 18 sentences. The sentences were selected so that an equal number contained a subject relative clause, an object relative clause or an object-of preposition relative clause. For each clause structure, the test contained four well formed exemplars, and two deviant exemplars. A further subdivision of deviant exemplars was possible for four of the learner groups. For these Ss, some of the deviant sentences

contained errors that typified the productions of members of that group while the other deviant sentences do not (e.g., Arab learners produce sentences without deleting the object pronoun such as "The problems that a tourist guide must face are numerous" but Japanese learners do not).

Schachter et al. hypothesized that Ss would accept well formed sentences as grammatical as well as sentences which contained deviations typical of their group; but that they would judge as ungrammatical other types of deviations.

For purposes of the present study, let us consider the data from the judgments made by the Arabic learners. These Ss, in general, did identify the well formed sentences as grammatical (82.4%). It appears, however, that they did not respond differentially to the two types of deviant sentences although these were apparently identified less often as grammatical than the well formed sentences (61% for the typically Arabic; no data given for the other class). The fact that four of the ten Arabic Ss were Algerians who were bilingual in Arabic and French may have confounded the data and Schachter et al. caution that further testing is necessary.

In the present study, we adopted certain aspects from each of the three studies described above to examine the reactions of Egyptian learners of English to well formed and to deviant sentences.

Method

Subjects. The Ss were 18 Egyptian, Arabic-speaking students who were attending classes at the English Language Institute (ELI) of the American University in Cairo (AUC). Students who apply for admission to AUC must take the Michigan Test Of English Language Proficiency. Students who score above 82 received direct admission to AUC; students who score below 82 but above 67 receive conditional admission. They enter the ELI where they follow an intensive program of English-language training.

Once students have been accepted into the ELI they follow a rather rigorous course of study. They are given 5 hours of English instruction a day 5 days a week.

Students are placed in classes according to their scores on the battery of tests administered by the ELI which consists of the following components: (1) The Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, (2) the Michigan Test of aural comprehension, and (3) a composition.

Although students are placed in classes according to their proficiency in English, there is a growing tendency to have a wider range of proficiencies within each class so that in fact the grades of the students in the upper level classes overlap. (This seems to be working rather well from the motivational point of view.) Dividing our students into classes this way leaves us roughly with 2 levels of proficiency -- advanced and intermediate (which are of course relative standards), or as we call them upper and lower level ELI students.

Instruction in each level is designed to satisfy the needs and solve the particular problems of these students.

In the lower levels emphasis is placed on guided writing, structured reading, vocabulary development and grammar. The listening and speaking skills are also stressed here. Students at this level usually spend an average of 5 hours a week either in the language laboratory or in some kind of listening activities.

Upper level students, on the other hand, are usually given a grammar review (it is taken for granted that they are familiar with the basic patterns of the English language) and stress is on clause work, complex type structures and the like. Extensive reading is also encouraged. In composition, assignments may vary from simple paragraphs to full length essays. Structural devices such as embedding and subordination are taught and practiced at this level. Skills such as reading and assimilating the information for the purpose of discussion; and intensive listening, note-taking, outlining and organization of material are basic skills which they lack and are therefore taught at this level.

It is obvious, then, that what is taught in the lower levels is considerably different from what is taught at the upper levels. It is assumed that the upper level ELI student will <u>not</u> spend more than one semester at the ELI whereas we do expect students in our lower levels to need more than one semester of English instruction to be able to function adequately at an English language university.

The Michigan scores of our students ranged from 71 - 77% and thus belonged to our upper level.

Qualitatively their English was in general adequate for communicative purposes but far from being correct. They were still making serious mistakes with tenses, articles, prepositions, word order, etc.... They had all come to us from Language Schools (which are semi-private schools where the medium of instruction is either French or English in addition to Arabic). So for most of these students English was the second rather than the first foreign language they were acquiring. They had all scored very highly on their Thanaweya Amma exam (which is the Egyptian official school leaving exam) and most of them had never had any formal English instruction before. When we tested them the semester had only just begun and therefore they had not been exposed to English Prescriptive Grammar in any way.

They were also very highly motivated and were eager to do well, both to remain at AUC (which is many ways is prestigous) and to improve their English proficiency as with Egypt's new economic policy the most lurative jobs in international companies, banks and various other organizations and concerns are available to speakers of English and to lesser degree French.

Stimulus Sentences. Twenty-eight stimulus sentences were chosen to include four exemplars which each of seven error categories (articles, prepositions, word order, number, deletion of object pronoun, tense and "other" -- errors typically made not by

Egyptian students, but by French Canadian students). The sentences appear in Appendix 1. The 24 sentences which contained typical Engyptian errors were selected by Sarofim from compositions written by her ELI students. Two lists of 28 stimulus sentences were constructed. Each group contained 14 well formed sentences with two exemplars for each of the seven categories and 14 deviant sentences, again with two exemplars for each of the seven categories. The sentences which were well formed on the first list became the deviant sentences on the second list and vice versa. Thus, all sentences were evaluated by some Ss in their deviant and in their correct form. By adding over the two lists it was possible to examine the responses, in general, to well formed versus deviant sentences.

Method of Presentation. The sentences on each of the lists were read aloud by a male native speaker of American English and by a male Arabic-English bilingual Egyptian teacher of English as a foreign language. Certain characteristic prosodic features and phonological cues marked the Egyptian as a non-native speaker.

The Tasks. The Ss performed three tasks. In Task 1, they listened to a tape-recorded version of the 28 stimulus sentences (14 deviant, 14 correct) read aloud and rated each sentence using two five-point semantic differential-type rating scales. The first was used to assess perceived grammaticality (from one, grammatically correct, to five, not grammatically correct); the second perceived acceptability (from one, acceptable to five, unacceptable). We

tried to convey the idea that the two scales were to be used quite independently, and that it was possible for a sentence rated as ungrammatical to be nevertheless viewed as acceptable. Each sentence was read only once and Ss had approximately 10 seconds to make the two ratings. One half of the Ss listened to a recording by a native speaker; the other half, to a recording by the non-native speaker.

In Task 2, Ss listened to a second recording which contained only the 14 deviant sentences from Task 1. They were asked to indicate, again using a five-point scale, whether each sentence bothered or irritated them a great deal (five) or did not bother them at all (one). Again, each sentence was read only once and Ss had approximately 8 seconds to respond.

In Task 3, Ss received a printed copy of the same 14 deviant sentences which they had heard on Tasks 1 and 2. They were asked to "draw a line underneath the error in each sentence and correct it if you can" and "in addition, please indicate for each sentence the extent to which the error bothers you" using the rating scale described for Task 2.

Method of Analysis. Four separate statistical analyses were performed on the data. A three-way analysis of variance, with repeated measures on one factor, was performed on the Ss' ratings of perscriptive grammaticality. The independent variables were correctness (that is whether the sentences were well formed or deviant); background of speaker (native or non-native); and

category of error (article, preposition, word order, number, deletion of object pronoun, tense, other). The dependent variable was the rating assigned by each S using the five-point rating scale -- grammatically correct . . . not grammatically correct.

A separate three-way analysis of variance was performed on the ratings assigned by each S using the five-point rating scale for acceptability -- acceptable . . . unacceptable. The independent variables were the same as above. In addition, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between the grammaticality and the acceptability ratings by Ss for each of the seven error categories. These correlations were calculated separately from the responses to the native speaker rendition and the non-native speaker rendition. Thus, a total of 14 correlation coefficients were calculated.

Next, a two-way analysis of variance with repeated measured on one factor was calculated on the Ss' ratings of irritability (Task 2). The independent variables were background of speaker (native or non-native) and category of error. The dependent variable was the rating assigned by each S using the five-point rating scale -- does not bother me at all . . . bothers me a great deal.

Results

Ratings of Grammaticality. The analysis revealed significant main effects for all factors: correctness ($F = 20.48$; 1,16 df; $p < .01$), background of speaker ($F = 24.98$; 1,16 df; $p < .01$), and category of error ($F = 7.83$; 6,96 df; $p < .01$). The well formed sentences were rated as being more correct ($\bar{X} = 2.03$) than the deviant sentences ($\bar{X} = 2.39$) while Ss rated the native speaker's rendition as being more correct ($\bar{X} = 1.93$) than that by the non-native speaker ($\bar{X} = 2.49$). This was a general and pervasive effect and the correctness-by-speaker interaction was not significant. Since there was a significant interaction among correctness, background of speaker and category ($F = 2.44$; 6,69 df; $p < .05$), it is appropriate to examine separately the heirarchy of error recognition for Ss when listening to the deviant sentences of the native speaker and of the non-native speaker. The order from least to most grammatical with a non-native speaker was: number, object pronoun deletion, "other", word order, article, tense, and preposition. With the native speaker, the order was tense, word order, number, "other", deletion of object pronoun, preposition and article. The Ss' subjective ratings are presented in Table 1. Two interesting facts emerge: 1) even though we are here considering only deviant sentences, the stimuli were rated in general as less deviant when read by a native speaker than by a non-native speaker, and 2) there was a good deal of variation in the hierarchy of ratings for the two speakers ($\rho = .12$, $N = 7$, NS). Thus,

there was a general tendency for our Ss to view deviant sentences produced by a native speaker as being more correct than the same sentences produced by a non-native speaker. We shall return to this observation.

Insert Table 1 about here

Ratings of Acceptability. This analysis also revealed significant main effects for all factors: correctness ($F = 12.74$; 1,16 df; $p < .01$), speaker ($F = 8.72$; 1,16 df; $p < .01$), and category ($F = 6.01$; 6,96 df; $p < .01$). The well formed sentences were rated as being more acceptable ($\bar{X} = 2.28$) than the deviant sentences ($\bar{X} = 2.51$) and Ss rated the native speaker's rendition as being more acceptable ($\bar{X} = 2.15$) than the non-natives ($\bar{X} = 2.64$). Once again this was a general and pervasive effect and the correctness-by-background of speaker interaction was not significant.

There was, however, a significant interaction among correctness, background of speaker and category of error ($F = 3.04$; 6,69 df; $p < .05$). Therefore, let us examine the hierarchy of acceptability by Ss listening to a native speaker or to a non-native speaker. The order from least to most acceptable with a non-native speaker was "other", deletion of object pronoun, number, article, word order, tense and preposition. The order with the native speaker was "other", tense, number, deletion of object pronoun, word order, preposition and article. The Ss' average subjective

ratings are presented in Table 2. Once again, the stimuli were rated in general as more acceptable when read by a native speaker than by a non-native speaker and there was considerable variation in the nierarchy of ratings for the two speakers (ρ = .46; N = 7, NS).

Insert Table 2 about here

We next examined the pattern of correlations for ratings of grammaticality and acceptability with the native speaker and with the non-native speaker. An examination of the entries in Table 3 and of the raw data suggest that when the Ss evaluate sentences read by the non-native speaker as ungrammatical they also rated them as unacceptable; but that there was a much greater latitude of acceptance for the native speaker. Thus, there was a tendency for Ss to view as acceptable some of the sentences that they had nevertheless rated as ungrammatical. This was particularly true for sentences which involved errors of preposition, word order or tense ready by the native speaker.

Insert Table 3 about here

Ratings of Irritability. This analysis revealed a significant main effect for category (F = 7.73; 6,96 df; $p < .05$); but not for background of speaker (F = 0.04; 1,16 df; NS). The inter-

action was not significant. Thus, there was a pronounced and well differentiated hierarchy of the error categories according to the degree of irritation or bother that they elicited in the listeners. Furthermore, the order was similar for both the native speaker and the non-native speaker. The average subjective ratings are presented in Table 4. It should be remembered that the Ss' were explicitly told that each of these sentences contained an error before they began this task. An hierarchy of irritability emerges from these data such that Ss are "bothered" most by errors involving word order, errors typical of French Canadian learners and failure to delete the redundant object pronoun, but less by errors involving prepositions and articles. The next step in this research involved asking native speakers to evaluate the same sentences to see whether the hierarchy of irritability was similar for native as well as for non-native listeners. The average subjective ratings for a small group (N = 10) of Canadian native speakers of English are also presented in Table 4. The hierarchy of irritability was remarkably similar for the two groups of listeners (ρ = .90, N = 7, $p < .01$) although the native speakers were, in general, slightly more lenient or tolerant than the Egyptian Ss.

Insert Table 4 about here

The last analysis in this study involved tabulating the proportion of errors by category that Egyptian Ss were able to correct. These data are also presented in Table 4. Note that Ss had most difficulty with the errors that were typical of French Canadians rather than with any of the "Egyptian" errors. In general, Ss found errors with number, word order and failure to delete the redundant object pronouns quite easy to correct, and those with prepositions reasonably difficult. An error analysis indicated that the Ss in this case most frequently identified the preposition as the source of error but inserted another incorrect preposition. It's interesting that they also found these errors, together with the French Canadian errors, as most irksome. Although we did not specifically choose the stimuli for this study to examine the hypotheses of Schachter et al. regarding determinate and indeterminate strings, the present data do not contradict those findings.

Results with less advanced EFL students. We also conducted a complementary investigation with groups of less advanced Egyptian EFL students who were attending English classes in the Division of Public Service of AUC. For the most part, these adult students are Egyptian workers who are trying to improve their command of English to enhance their opportunities for occupational advancement, etc. They attend evening English classes 6 hours per week. Unfortunately, we found that many of these Ss simply could not cope with the task. We received incomplete and, in a number of

cases, incomprehensible answer sheets from a majority of the DPS students. For those from whom we did obtain complete data we found that they were able to correct fewer than 30% of the errors with the deviant sentences in Task 3. Furthermore, we found a statistically nonsignificant tendency for them to rate the deviant sentences as more correct and more acceptable, on the average, than the well formed sentences; but the within subject variation was very high. Therefore, we will not present additional data from this phase of our investigation; but we do believe that our work with the DPS students supports d'Anglejan (1975) claim that the ability to recognize deviance is a reliable correlate of developing second language competence.

Discussion

The following general conclusions seem warranted on the basis of the data collected in this study: 1) advanced Egyptian EFL students did distinguish between well formed and deviant sentences and rated the former as being more correct and more acceptable than the latter; 2) this effect was more pronounced when the sentences were read by a native speaker of English than by a non-native speaker and, in addition, <u>all</u> ratings shifted toward the more acceptable, more grammatical end of the scale when the sentences were presented by the native speaker, -- thus, it seems that the latitude of acceptability for a native speaker is greater than for a non-native speaker; 3) the deviant sentences were, on the average, mildly irritating and those read by the non-native

were more irritating than those read by the native although this effect was nonsignificant; 4) these students had most difficulty correcting errors involving prepositions or other typically French Canadian errors and very little difficulty correcting errors with number, word order, or object pronoun deletion; 5) the category of error most irksome to Egyptians was word order closely followed by "other" (i.e., those typically produced by French Canadians), while the categories of word order and failure to delete the object pronoun were most irritating to a group of native speakers of English; and 6) the categories of error least bothersome to Egyptians and to native speakers were articles and prepositions.

These data provide at least limited support for hypotheses advanced by d'Anglejan (1975) and by Schachter et al.(1976). Our interest in this line of research continues. We accept, in their general form, the "new" views concerning second language acquisition that seem to permeate much of the research literature of the 70's (see, for example, Hatch, 1977; Richards, in press) and likewise, we accept the general notion that the second language learner passes through a series of transitional stages or approximative systems as he moves gradually from zero competence to native speaker competence in a target language. Furthermore, we believe that it should be possible to describe more precisely his ability with respect to a variety of target language features at each of four stages: 1) a stage at which his production of a selected

feature is deviant and he is unable to recognize deviance; 2) a stage at which his production is deviant but he can recognize deviance although he cannot correct deviant productions; 3) a stage at which he can recognize and correct deviance; and 4) a stage at which productions are well formed. Additional data relevant to this latter goal have recently been presented by Hamayan, (1978), and by Johansson, (1978).

Our data did not permit us to address directly or as completely as we would have liked three other questions and we pose them as topics for future research: 1) do listeners have differing tolerances for errors depending upon whether they are produced by native or non-native speakers and what are the concomitant societal implications -- that is, consider the effects of "errors" produced by a native speaker of standard American English, by a native speaker of black non-standard English and by an immigrant learner (cf., Schmidt & McCreary, 1977); 2) do different groups of listeners -- native speakers, highly proficient non-native speakers, non-native speakers with limited proficiency -- have different ranges of tolerance for deviance; and 3) what is the nature of the relationship between second language proficiency and ability to recognize and to compensate for target language deviance?

From a more practical standpoint, our study then seemed to indicate that intuitional data are in fact useful when trying to probe various facets of how and why non-native speakers perform as they do. As mentioned earlier, although many researchers have

speculated about the causes of errors, not many studies have taken into consideration a student's ability to recognize deviance.

The present study, though, seems to indicate that by taking into account a student's ability to recognize deviant utterances we gain a better insight into his overall language proficiency. Since our data seem to support the idea that a second language learner passes through a series of transitional stages as he moves from zero competence to native speaker competence in the target language, we might want to ask whether on the basis of the type of error and/or the amount of deviant sentences which the learner is able to recognize and correct, we couldn't in fact translate the results into practical teaching strategies adapted to each transitional stage; or whether the results would enable us to determine what kind of classroom instruction or methodology would be better suited to each stage of the learner's language acquisition. We might also want to ask whether we could establish language priorities in a program based on the kinds of errors recognized and the students' attitudes towards them. Could we use error recognition in placement exams or as diagnostic tests to assess language competence? Could we use tests like these to guide us effectively in the selection, grouping, adapting, preparing and sequencing of materials? Are the Egyptian students' differing attitude towards written and oral stimuli, indicative of the precedence of one form over the other? Do they offer us insight to the particular needs of our students which might help us in our

teaching? Does the differing tolerance of errors by Egyptian students, depending upon whether they are produced by native or non-native speakers, indicate that more importance should be attached to pronunciation and prosodic features in EFL classrooms?

To all these questions, we have no definite answers; but it is obvious that there is a strong need to study students' attitudes and performance toward deviance, in both the written and spoken forms of language at the various stages of language proficiency. We can do so by collecting intuitional data. Hopefully, this will eventually lead to better instruction, more effective teaching methods and materials and more successful second language learning which is our aim.

FOOTNOTE

1. The preparation of this manuscript was supported by grants from the Canada Council to W. E. Lambert and G. R. Tucker, and the Ministry of Education of the Province of Quebec to A. d'Anglejan and G. R. Tucker.

REFERENCES

d'Anglejan, A. Dynamics of second language development: a search for linguistic regularity. Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 1975.

Corder, S. P. The significance of learner's errors. IRAL, 1967, 5, 161-170.

Gleitman, L. R., Gleitman, H., & Shipley, E. The emergence of the child as grammarian. Cognition, 1972, 1, 137-163.

Hamayan, E. Acquisition of French syntactic structures: Production strategies and awareness of errors by native and non-native speakers. Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, Montreal, 1978.

Hatch, E. R. Second language learning. In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives, Vol. 2. Arlington, Va.: Center for applied Linguistics, 1977.

Johansson, S. Problems in studying the communicative effect of learner's errors. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1978, 1, 41-52.

Quirk, R., & Svartvik, J. Investigating Linguistic Acceptability. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.

Richards, J. C. Understanding second language learning: issues and approaches. Rowley, Ma.: Newbury, in press.

Schachter, J., Tyson, A. F., & Diffley, F. J. Learner intuitions about grammaticality. Language Learning, 1976, 26, 67-76.

Schmidt, R. W., & McCreary, C. F. Standard and super-standard English: recognition and use of prescriptive rules by native and non-native speakers. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11, 415-429.

Singh, R., & d'Anglejan, A. Aspects of non-native English. Second Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development, 1977.

Table 1

Ratings of Prescriptive Grammaticality

for Deviant Sentences

Non-native Speaker		Native Speaker	
Category	Mean Rating	Category	Mean Rating
Number	3.00	Tense	2.61
Object pronoun deletion	3.00	Word order	2.58
Other	2.97	Number	2.55
Word order	2.50	Other	2.27
Article	2.41	Object pronoun deletion	1.94
Tense	2.38	Preposition	1.61
Preposition	2.25	Article	1.41

Note: 1 = grammatical

5 = ungrammatical

Table 2

Ratings of Acceptability for Deviant Sentences

Non-native Speaker		Native Speaker	
Category	Mean Rating	Category	Mean Rating
Other	3.16	Other	2.69
Object pronoun deletion	2.86	Tense	2.61
Number	2.80	Number	2.55
Article	2.80	Object pronoun deletion	2.50
Word order	2.72	Word order	2.47
Tense	2.50	Preposition	1.69
Preposition	2.33	Article	1.38

Note: 1 = acceptable

5 = unacceptable

Table 3

Correlations between Ratings of Grammaticality and Acceptability for Deviant Sentences

Category	Native Speaker	Non-native Speaker
Article	.39	.74**
Preposition	.03	.67**
Word order	.22	.64**
Number	.52*	.46*
Object pronoun deletion	.38	.82**
Tense	.28	.89**
Other	.43*	.84**

Note: *indicates $p < .05$

**indicates $p < .01$

Table 4

Ratings of Irritability for Deviant Sentences

of Egyptian and Canadian Students

Category	Egyptian Judges	Canadian Judges	Proportion of Errors Corrected
Word order	3.41	3.35	.72
Other	3.23	3.20	.33
Object pronoun deletion	3.13	3.35	.72
Number	3.09	2.50	.83
Tense	3.06	2.60	.56
Proposition	2.50	2.45	.44
Article	2.29	2.25	.61

Note: 1 = does not bother me at all

5 = bothers me a great deal

APPENDIX 1

1. The most important of all human characteristics is the sense of humor.
2. Everyone tries to make a good progress in his field.
3. There is a difference between an American woman and the Egyptian one.
4. Some people think that the space travel is not useful.
5. The answer for this question is "yes".
6. I applied for the scholarship from the university.
7. He wanted to sell the pear with a high price.
8. The Egyptian people are known for their love to others.
9. I read in the university newspaper an advertisement.
10. We wish to get from that enjoyment.
11. I don't know why are cigarettes taxes.
12. I saw how dirty were the streets.
13. So, I took the advices of my parents.
14. We was reading the newspaper when the bell rang.
15. There is no places to go in the summer.
16. There is a lot of other qualities which I admire.
17. They spend their lives studying something which they won't need it later on.
18. It's not right to spend so much money on something we are not sure about.
19. These were the most important points that I would like them to be in my future husband.
20. I passed by a big building which I knew it was the American University in Cairo.

21. Before I was accepted at AUC I had been examined.

22. I am hearing the noise in the kitchen.

23. I'm here since last month.

24. The Bedouin nomads are dressing in long flowing robes both summer and winter.

25. Do you know what that mean?

26. Can you tell me what did you do?

27. Do you know what is a circus?

28. How much sister or brother do you have?

Error Categories

Sentences	Error Type
1, 2, 27, 28	Articles
3, 4, 25, 26	Prepositions
5, 6, 23, 24	Word order
7, 8, 21, 22	Number
9, 10, 19, 20	Deletion of object pronoun
11, 12, 17, 18	Tense
13, 14, 15, 16	Other (French Canadian)